

GENERAL

This document provides Ameritech¹ customers, especially those who employ Ameritech's services as part of telecommunications services they provide to their end users, with a process to request Ameritech to provide a new or custom capability or function to meet their needs.

Included in this document is an Ameritech Bona Fide Request (BFR) Form. This form may be reproduced and submitted to Ameritech's Bona Fide Request Manager listed on the first page of the form.

1. BACKGROUND

Pursuant to the provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and other regulatory or statutory rules (e.g., the Federal Communication Commission's (FCC) Open Network Architecture (ONA) program), Ameritech may be asked to provide a new or modified network element, interconnection option, or other service options that Ameritech does not already provide on a general basis. The nature of these custom and new requests may vary widely. Ameritech has developed a BFR process to meet the widest variety of requests in a consistent and timely fashion.

2. THE BONA FIDE REQUEST PROCESS

2.1 OVERVIEW OF THE BFR PROCESS

The BFR process is intended to facilitate the two-way exchange of information between the requesting party and Ameritech necessary for prompt and accurate processing of requests. The process is structured so that milestones are completed within specified intervals. Under the BFR process, a preliminary analysis, including confirmation whether or not the request qualifies; an initial assessment of its technical feasibility; general product availability; and expected "product ready" date. This preliminary analysis will normally be completed within 30 calendar days. Where feasible, a projected order of magnitude price will also be provided. A full evaluation of each request, including any product development activity and final pricing, is normally completed within 120 calendar days.

2.2 DETAILS OF THE BFR PROCESS

The process begins with the submission of a BFR Form by the requester. Ameritech has established a single point of contact, a Bona Fide Request Manager, who is responsible for the receipt, tracking and coordination of all BFRs.

¹ For purposes of this document Ameritech means Illinois Bell Telephone Company (Ameritech - Illinois), Indiana Bell Telephone Company Incorporated (Ameritech - Indiana), Michigan Bell Telephone Company (Ameritech - Michigan), The Ohio Bell Telephone Company (Ameritech - Ohio), and the Wisconsin Bell, Inc. (Ameritech - Wisconsin).

When submitting the BFR, the requesting carrier has two options with respect to compensating Ameritech for its costs incurred in completing its preliminary analysis of the BFR request (first 30 days). The requesting carrier may either:

1. Include a \$2,000 deposit (per state) to cover Ameritech's preliminary evaluation costs and Ameritech will guarantee that the preliminary evaluation costs incurred during the first 30 days will not exceed \$2,000 (per state), or
2. Not make any deposit and agree to promptly pay the total preliminary evaluation costs incurred by Ameritech during the first 30 days.

Should Ameritech not be able to process the BFR or determine that the request does not qualify for BFR treatment, the \$2,000 deposit (per state) will be returned to the requesting carrier. Similarly, if the costs incurred to complete the preliminary analysis are less than \$2,000 (per state), the balance of the deposit will, at the option of the requesting carrier, either be refunded or credited toward additional development costs authorized by the requester after receipt of the formal 30-day response. The requester may also cancel its BFR request during the preliminary analysis process (first 30 days) and pay only Ameritech's costs incurred to the date of cancellation.

When the BFR form is received, the BFR Manager will review it for completeness and to determine if Ameritech understands the request and if all information necessary to process the request has been provided. If information necessary for evaluation of the request is missing or additional information will facilitate the processing of the request, the BFR Manager will contact the requester for the necessary information. Next, the BFR Manager will determine whether the request qualifies under the regulatory classification identified in Question 13.

As soon as feasible after receipt of the BFR, but normally no later than 10 business days (or as otherwise agreed to or required) after receipt of the BFR, the BFR Manager will issue a confirmation notice, either confirming that the BFR is being processed and notifying the requester of the key dates assigned to the request or formally notifying the requester that information required to process the request has still not been received, and that the request will be held in abeyance until the additional information is received. If, for some reason, the BFR cannot be processed or does not qualify for BFR treatment, the requester will be notified of that fact normally within 10 business days of receipt or as soon thereafter as Ameritech makes that determination.

Activities undertaken by the BFR Manager during the first 30 calendar days are focused on a preliminary assessment of the request, including its technical feasibility. If the requester is seeking a combination of network elements, Ameritech will also focus on whether the proposed combination can be made to function as a single element. The BFR Manager has various subject matter experts (SMEs) available to help complete the preliminary evaluation. If it is determined that the requested capability is technically feasible, and, if applicable, can function as a single element, an evaluation is then undertaken to determine whether it is already generally available, and if so, whether the other offering meets the requester's needs. The results of this analysis will be conveyed to the requester as a part of the 30-day formal response. The 30-day formal response also will include an indication of the following: (1) if the request qualifies under the Act or applicable regulatory requirements; (2) the results of the technical feasibility analysis; (3) if the request is for a combination of network elements, if they can function as a single element; (4) whether the requested capability is generally available today; if it is not available, the projected costs of development; and, (5) if further development is required, a form by which the requester can authorize the further development of the requested

capability. If feasible, Ameritech will also provide a proposed order of magnitude projected price based upon any quantity and term commitment specified.

Following the formal 30-day notification, no further action will be taken on the BFR until Ameritech has received the requester's authorization to proceed. Following receipt of the 30-day notification, the requesting carrier has the following options:

1. Cancel the BFR without any further liability to Ameritech to order the requested capability. However, the requesting carrier shall be responsible to compensate Ameritech for the costs it incurred prior to the date of cancellation in accordance with the options discussed above.
2. Authorize Ameritech to proceed with further development and/or pricing of the request based upon the requesting carrier's agreement to compensate Ameritech for any costs it incurs in developing and pricing the request, up to the estimated amount specified in the 30-day notice. If the requesting carrier wishes, in order to obtain lower non-recurring or recurring charges it may ask for prices that are based upon term and/or volume discounts.
3. Instances where Ameritech has provided an order of magnitude price quote, it may authorize Ameritech to proceed with development and/or pricing of the request based upon the requesting carrier's agreement to compensate Ameritech for the costs it incurs in further developing and pricing the request, up to the amount specified in the 30-day notice, or to order the request in the quantity and term specified, if the final price quoted by Ameritech is within the range specified in the 30-day notice.
4. Unless Ameritech receives written notification that the requesting carrier is exercising one of the above options within 30 days of Ameritech issuing the 30-day notification, the offer shall be automatically withdrawn without notice.

Once an authorization to proceed is received, normally no more than 90 calendar days will be used to complete any product development work required. The request will be assigned to a Product Manager and a product team will be formed to develop the offering. This includes an evaluation of the product's costs. Any term/quantity information submitted by the requester will be used in this evaluation. If option 3 above was selected, and Ameritech's evaluation determines that the product cannot be offered at the requested price and cover its costs plus a reasonable allocation of forward-looking joint and common costs, the requester will be provided the option of purchasing the requested capability at the price offered by Ameritech with volume and/or term commitments sufficient to allow Ameritech to recover its costs plus a reasonable allocation of forward-looking joint and common costs, or canceling the order and paying for the product's development, i.e., covering Ameritech's applicable costs of analyzing, developing, provisioning, and pricing the service plus a reasonable allocation of forward-looking joint and common costs as applicable. Also, at any time during the 90 days, the requester may indicate that processing of the request should be terminated and thereby limit its obligations to pay for the product development to those costs incurred through the date of termination.

Upon completion of this product development phase, but normally no longer than 90 calendar days, the requester will be provided with a final product delineation which will include a product description, proposed rates, ordering intervals, and methods and procedures for ordering the service and an invoice for the development and pricing costs incurred. The requester then has 30 calendar days to submit either firm orders for or cancel the requested capability at the final price quoted by Ameritech (consistent with any volume and/or term commitments), and remit the amount of Ameritech development costs as described above.

3. BONA FIDE REQUEST INITIATION

The key document in the Bona Fide Request process is the Bona Fide Request Form. A copy of the form is included at the end of this practice. The BFR Form provides Ameritech detailed and specific information about the service, capability, network element or interconnection option being requested and describes how the request qualifies as a network element or form of interconnection to be provided pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 or under another regulatory or statutory requirement. There are 14 data items associated with each request. They are:

- (a) Requester's name, address and contact information (BFR Form, Question 1);
- (b) Description of the service or network element being requested (BFR Form, Question 2);
- (c) Whether the request involves modification or combination of an existing service element or information about the service or facility being modified (BFR Form, Question 3);
- (d) Whether the requested item is available from another service element or from another source (BFR Form, Question 4);
- (e) Description of any desired special operational characteristics (BFR Form, Question 5);
- (f) Illustrations or drawings which help in understanding the request (BFR Form, Question 6);
- (g) Information concerning the expected service and/or location life of the requested capability (BFR Form, Question 7);
- (h) A non-disclosure statement regarding shared information (BFR Form, Question 8);
- (i) Locations and points of interconnection or access (cities, wire centers, etc.) by state where the capability is desired (BFR Form, Question 9);
- (j) Expected demand for the requested service (BFR Form, Question 10);
- (k) Pricing assumptions underlying the demand estimates (BFR Form, Question 11);
- (l) Any other information which the requester feels may facilitate evaluation and development (BFR Form, Question 12);
- (m) Classification information (BFR Form, Question 13);
- (n) Problems or issues needing resolution. Reason for obtaining feature or if cannot obtain, would it impair your ability to provide services (BFR Form, Question 14);
- (o) Selection of preliminary analysis cost payment option (BFR Form, Question 15).

Each of these items will facilitate processing of request for the development of a new or custom service, capability or new or modified network element or interconnection option. These items are similar to those that are requested by any firm in evaluating a request for a new or custom product. Moreover, this information provides the basis for a sound technical and economic analysis of the request -- an analysis which will support fact-based decision making.

4. SUMMARY

The process also benefits regulators by helping to minimize the need for arbitration and/or complaints by facilitating constructive negotiations. To the extent there are any such proceedings, the BFR process will provide regulators with a detailed record with regard to both the request and Ameritech's response which can form the basis for prompt and proper dispute resolution. The public will also benefit because the process promotes both the introduction of new interconnection capabilities and unbundled services while minimizing the costs incurred by Ameritech in responding to these types of requests.

AMERITECH BONA FIDE REQUEST FORM

The information requested in this form is essential for our assessment of your request. This information will enable us to process your Bona Fide Request (BFR) and to perform a technical assessment of its feasibility. This BFR Form initiates the process Ameritech uses to evaluate requests for further unbundling or interconnection as provided for in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 or other applicable state or federal regulations.

Please complete the form in full, and submit via facsimile to the Ameritech Information Industry Services (AIIS) Bona Fide Request Manager at 810-483-3738. If you desire to contact the BFR Manager directly he or she can be reached at 810-443-9900. The Bona Fide Request Manager will be your single point of contact within Ameritech concerning your request. The representative is responsible for tracking and coordinating your request and will, at a minimum, send the following to you:

1. Written confirmation of receipt of the request (normally within 10 business days).
2. Written status when the initial technical feasibility analysis is completed (normally within 30 calendar days) and request for authorization to proceed.
3. Written notification concerning the final disposition of the request (normally within 90 calendar days of receipt of your authorization to proceed).

The above schedule is subject to modification based upon the specific requirement of each agreement and each state. Should you have any further questions regarding this application or the process or the Bona Fide Request process please feel free to contact the BFR Manager at the number shown above.

AMERITECH BONA FIDE REQUEST FORM

1) Requested By

(Company Name)

(Address)

(Contact Person)

(Facsimile Number)

(Phone Number)

(Date of Request)

(Optional: E-Mail Address)

2) Description of the network interconnection capability, function, system, element or feature or combination requested (use additional sheets of paper to describe the requested service, if necessary):

4. SUMMARY

The process also benefits regulators by helping to minimize the need for arbitration and/or complaints by facilitating constructive negotiations. To the extent there are any such proceedings, the BFR process will provide regulators with a detailed record with regard to both the request and Ameritech's response which can form the basis for prompt and proper dispute resolution. The public will also benefit because the process promotes both the introduction of new interconnection capabilities and unbundled services while minimizing the costs incurred by Ameritech in responding to these types of requests.

AMERITECH BONA FIDE REQUEST FORM

The information requested in this form is essential for our assessment of your request. This information will enable us to process your Bona Fide Request (BFR) and to perform a technical assessment of its feasibility. This BFR Form initiates the process Ameritech uses to evaluate requests for further unbundling or interconnection as provided for in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 or other applicable state or federal regulations.

Please complete the form in full, and submit via facsimile to the Ameritech Information Industry Services (AIIS) Bona Fide Request Manager at 810-483-3738. If you desire to contact the BFR Manager directly he or she can be reached at 810-443-9900. The Bona Fide Request Manager will be your single point of contact within Ameritech concerning your request. The representative is responsible for tracking and coordinating your request and will, at a minimum, send the following to you:

1. Written confirmation of receipt of the request (normally within 10 business days).
2. Written status when the initial technical feasibility analysis is completed (normally within 30 calendar days) and request for authorization to proceed.
3. Written notification concerning the final disposition of the request (normally within 90 calendar days of receipt of your authorization to proceed).

The above schedule is subject to modification based upon the specific requirement of each agreement and each state. Should you have any further questions regarding this application or the process or the Bona Fide Request process please feel free to contact the BFR Manager at the number shown above.

AMERITECH BONA FIDE REQUEST FORM

1) Requested By

(Company Name)

(Address)

(Contact Person)

(Facsimile Number)

(Phone Number)

(Date of Request)

(Optional: E-Mail Address)

2) Description of the network interconnection capability, function, system, element or feature or combination requested (use additional sheets of paper to describe the requested service, if necessary):

AMERITECH BONA FIDE REQUEST FORM

- 3) Is this a request for a modification or combination of existing services or network elements? If so, please explain the modification or combination and describe the existing services or elements(s) or indicate its name.

- 4) Is this a service or network element available from any other source or a service or network element already offered by Ameritech? If yes, please provide source's name and the name of the service or network element.

- 5) Is there anything custom or specific about the manner that you would like this feature, function or combination to operate?

- 6) If possible, please include a drawing or illustration of how you would like the request to operate and interact with the network.

- 7) Please describe the expected location life, if applicable, of this capability (i.e., period of time you will use it). Do you view this as a temporary or long range arrangement?

AMERITECH BONA FIDE REQUEST FORM

- 8) If you wish to submit this information on a non-disclosure basis, please indicate this here. If non-disclosure is requested, either attach a prepared Ameritech non-disclosure agreement, or request one to be sent to you for completion or identify an existing agreement that covers this transaction, and properly identify any information you consider confidential.

- 9) Where do you want this capability deployed?

A) State (Check one state)*

- ☐ Illinois
☐ Indiana
☐ Michigan
☐ Ohio
☐ Wisconsin

* Since separate agreement and rules apply in each state, a separate BFR Form, and if applicable, deposit is required for each state for which you wish to have Ameritech process the BFR.

B) Major metropolitan area(s), in the state included above. (Please list area name):

C) Specific wire centers (use a separate document if necessary) or other points of interconnection or access where this capability is desired:

AMERITECH BONA FIDE REQUEST FORM

10) What is the expected demand of each location, e.g., estimated number of customers, subscriber lines, number of units to be ordered?

Location	Estimate of demand/units
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>

11) What are your pricing assumptions? In order to potentially obtain lower non-recurring or recurring charges you may specify quantity and/or term commitments you are willing to make. Please provide any price/quantity forecast indicating one or more desired pricing points (use additional sheets if necessary).

12) Please include any other information that could be of assistance to Ameritech in the evaluation of this service request:

AMERITECH BONA FIDE REQUEST FORM

13) Please classify the nature of your request (Check one).

☐

Request for interconnection

☐

Request for a new network element

☐

Request for a combination of network elements

☐

Request for a Physical Collocation where there is no space available for either physical or virtual collocation in the requested Ameritech Central Office.

☐

Request for enhanced service capability under the Open Network Architecture (ONA) program.

☐

New service or capability that does not fit into any of the above categories.

14) What problem or issue do you wish to solve? Why is it necessary for you to obtain this feature or if it were unavailable, how would it impair your ability to provide your services?

15) Preliminary analysis cost payment option (Check one).

☐

\$2,000 deposit per state included with request under the understanding that my responsibility for Ameritech's costs shall not exceed this deposit for the preliminary analysis during the first 30 days.

☐

No deposit is made and (Requesting Carrier Name) agrees to pay Ameritech's total preliminary analysis costs incurred until I cancel the request.

AMERITECH BONA FIDE REQUEST FORM

By submitting this request, except as provided, we agree to promptly compensate Ameritech for any costs it incurs in processing this request, including costs of analyzing, developing, provisioning, or pricing the request, until the Ameritech BFR Manager receives our written cancellation. We also agree to compensate Ameritech for such costs in accordance with its practice, if we fail to authorize Ameritech to proceed with development within 30 days of receipt of the 30-day notification, or we fail to order the service within 30 days, in accordance with the final product quotation. We certify that a copy of the practice is available to us.

by: _____
its: _____

STATE OF MICHIGAN**BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In the matter of the petition of)	
AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF MICHIGAN, INC.,)	
for arbitration to establish an interconnection)	Case No. U-11151
agreement with Ameritech Michigan.)	
_____)	

In the matter of the petition of)	
AMERITECH MICHIGAN for arbitration)	
to establish an interconnection agreement with)	Case No. U-11152
AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc.)	
_____)	

At the November 26, 1996 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. John G. Strand, Chairman
Hon. John C. Shea, Commissioner
Hon. David A. Svanda, Commissioner

ORDER APPROVING AGREEMENT ADOPTED BY ARBITRATION**I.****HISTORY OF PROCEEDINGS**

On August 1, 1996, AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc., (AT&T) filed a petition for arbitration with the Commission regarding the terms, conditions, and prices for interconnection and related arrangements with Ameritech Michigan pursuant to Section 252(b) of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the FTA), 47 USC 252(b). In accordance with the proce-

— standing technical issues. Finally, Ameritech contends that, even assuming that operator services and directory assistance routing or branding is technically feasible in all instances, the technical routing or branding solution may vary from switch to switch, which will cause the cost of the combination to vary on a switch-by-switch basis. Because such a variance in costs suggests that the combination should not be provided as a standard offer, Ameritech Michigan insists that its position that the combination should be available through a bona fide request is the only reasonable alternative on this record.

The Commission finds that Ameritech Michigan's position on Issue 10 should be adopted. The arbitration panel rejected Ameritech Michigan position on this issue primarily because the panel felt that Ameritech Michigan had not demonstrated that the offering was not technically feasible. However, as pointed out by Ameritech Michigan, the interconnection agreement contains examples of the parties' shared understanding that there are unresolved technical issues. As pointed out in its objections, Section 10.10.2 of the interconnection agreement and Section 8.9 of Schedule 9.5 reflect the parties' understanding that technical feasibility is a legitimate concern in Ameritech Michigan's ability to provide the combination. Moreover, the Commission is concerned that the cost of the combination could vary on a switch-by-switch basis. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the Unbundled Element Platform Without Operator Services and Directory Assistance should be offered through a bona fide request and not as a standard offering.

Gross Receipts Tax

Both parties proposed language regarding the liability for payment of taxes. They were unable to agree on the issue of liability for payment of taxes levied on gross receipts.

Information Industry Services
360 North Orleans Street
Floor 3
Chicago IL 60654
Office 312/335 8532
Fax 312/335 2927



June 17, 1997

VIA FAX 810-204-0329 & US MAIL

FILE COPY

Mr. William Riggan
Central Region Vice President
Teleport Communications Group
1000 Town Center, Suite 150
Southfield, Michigan 48075

Warren L. Michaels
Vice President
Customer Operations

Dear Bill

This letter is to confirm our understanding of the interconnection trunking matters that we discussed on June 6 and June 12, including those referenced in your May 9 letter to me.

With reference to your May 9 letter:

1. We agree that Local and Toll groups will be combined. Orders have been issued, the conversion will be coordinated so there is no service impact and the orders will complete between late June and August 1.
2. We are establishing Local and/or Toll trunk groups directly between Ameritech and offices and TCG. Because each company provides its own transport facilities for its trunks and as agreed, we will each install the trunk groups as two-way but they will carry traffic as one-way groups rather than in both directions. We will continue to work with you to address the administrative, engineering and capital expense allocation issues that prevent us from utilizing these as two-way groups at this time.

We have jointly identified many candidate offices for direct trunking. We anticipate implementing most of these groups. The groups will be prioritized based on traffic volumes, tandem service levels and the need for tandem relief.

3. We are getting mixed signals from TCG on the interconnection architecture. Both you and Tom Schroeder, TCG Director from Staten Island agreed to establish trunking from each of the TCG POIs to each of the Ameritech Tandems. We are in agreement with this network architecture.

However, Bob Nichols, also with TCG in New York, advocated staying with the existing architecture or as stated at the May 22 meeting, a new architecture which we do not do for ourselves. We need clarification on the TCG position.

If we use the architecture of establishing trunk groups from each tandem to each TCG POI, then Ameritech will be able to treat the TCG POIs as we do our own end offices.



Mr. William Riggan
Page Two
June 17, 1997

That is, the first choice route is via direct end office trunk groups - originating Ameritech end office to TCG POI; the second choice is from the originating Ameritech end office to terminating TCG POI's tandem to the TCG POI; the third choice is from the originating Ameritech office to the originating office's tandem to the terminating TCG POI; and the fourth choice is from the originating end office to the originating end office's tandem then on the intermachine group to the terminating TCG POI's tandem to the TCG POI.

We can also preplan emergency reroutes to handle network disasters and/or severe overloads. By establishing trunking from each TCG POI to each Ameritech tandem, we will have a full range of options for these disaster recovery preplans. These reroutes would be instituted under the direction of the Ameritech and TCG Network Management Centers to improve call completions.

4. Ameritech will provide TCG examples of specific trunk group data that can be used in the regular service meetings. We will provide you with this report by June 23.
5. Ameritech has planned the transmission facilities to the Plymouth and Troy TCG POIs. When these transport facilities are completed, trunks will be established and traffic routed to these POIs. The phases associated with this network rearrangement as well as the timeline were presented at the May 22 joint planning meeting.

Additionally, you have agreed to identify any specific blocking situations you have observed. As we discussed, our traffic data indicates that there is no blocking of TCG traffic at this time.

As in the past, we look forward to furthering our relationship through continued joint planning sessions.

Sincerely,



Warren L. Mickens
Vice President
Customer Operations

bcc: Jim Smith
Ray Thomas
Paul Monti
Sue West

TELEPORT/AMERITECH NETWORK PLANNING MEETING MINUTES

Minutes of the April 23, 1997 meeting.

Attendees:

Teleport

Bob Nicholson
Sharon Gallo
Verne Sliger
Terry Dudgeon

Ameritech

Jim Smith
Marilyn Le Houillier
Ken Badali
Joanne Hudson
Connie Gibson
Bob Kristensen
Rick Kassa
Paul Monti
Ray Thomas
Linda Samberg
Tom Schroeder
Patrick Kenney

The purpose of the meeting was to design the interconnection networks in Chicago and Detroit. Attachment 1 is the meeting agenda. This meeting was a follow up to the network planning meetings held on April 3 for Chicago and April 4 for Detroit. At these meetings, the architecture (i.e., trunking to each tandem) for each LATA was discussed and agreed to by both TCG and Ameritech.

We first discussed the Chicago network. Tom Schroeder described (and drew) the current interconnection architecture. Attachments 2a, 2b and 2c show the sketch of the Chicago network.

Several items were raised. TCG wanted to know why two IXC groups. A: Because of the Meet Point Billing agreement that each company provide 50% of the trunking for the interLATA traffic. TCG will provide the IF group and Ameritech will provide the AF group.

TCG indicated that they will formalize their forecasting process. Sharon Gallo will be the single point of contact on forecasting. Ameritech distributed forecasting forms. TCG will review and we will jointly develop the forecasting procedures. This will be done at the periodic performance meetings.

Ray Thomas described the goals of the performance meetings. That is, review the performance issues for the previous month, review the forecasts and discuss the expectations for the next month.

TCG asked how we are going to monitor the trunk groups given the high growth rates TCG is experiencing. Ameritech responded that we are being more vigilant and responsive to the TCG trunking needs.

TCG will share their ISP type information (i.e., the NXXs used by ISP and the amount of traffic or Tis used by the ISP). This will aid Ameritech with establishing direct and office trunking and sizing the network. TCG committed to identify their high growth NXXs. (Verne Sliger has these action items.)

Ameritech then sketched the proposed network for Chicago that was approved at the April 3 meeting. See Attachment 3 for the schematic.

We discussed adding direct and office trunk groups. Ameritech identified offices requiring direct trunking to TCG. TCG has identified offices requiring direct trunking to Ameritech. Ameritech (Patrick Kenny) and TCG (Sharon Gallo) will prioritize establishing these groups.)

We agreed to combine local and toll traffic on the same group -- both direct and tandem groups. We also agreed to maintain the 1 way trunk groups with each company responsible for providing the transport for their trunking (we collocate with each other).

TCG then indicated that they did not agree with the proposed architecture shown on Attachment 3. That is, there would be trunk groups from each TCG node to each of the tandems. Ameritech indicated that this was per the Interconnection Agreement and was agreed to at the April 3 meeting. [At the 4/3 meeting were Cathy Mason, Tom Schroeder, Sharon Gallo and Verne Sliger who agreed with the architecture.]

We need to determine the proper CLLI code for each TCG POI that we build the trunking to. Currently, these groups are build to the CNCGIL24DS0 CLLI code. However the groups were established prior to industry standards. The present standards are to use the POI CLLI MD. TCG will research and let Ameritech know so we can establish the direct trunk groups.

TCG also indicated they wanted our TCIC assignment guidelines. They are as follows:

<u>Direction</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>TCIC</u>
Ameritech to TCG	Local	05001-06996
	Toll	07001-08996
	Combined	03001-08996
	IXC (AF)	09001-09996
TCG to Ameritech	Local	00001-01996
	Toll	02001-03996
	Combined	06001-03996
	IXC (IF)	04001-04996

We discussed establishing a control sheet with reference to TCG designations and Ameritech designations. For example, for each trunk group list the Trunk Group Number, 2/6 code, Order number and TCICs for each company. This will allow the technicians of each company to talk to each other and have cross reference information on each trunk group. Tom Schroeder and Sharon Galle have this action item.

TCG (Verne) identified the roll-over of 7 TIs of trunking from Lagrange tandem to TCG OakBrook node from the copper T spans to the fiber facilities as a priority item.

The priorities for the Chicago LATA are: 1) establish the direct trunks to relieve Wabash tandem; 2) establish direct trunks to relieve Northbrook tandem; and 3) establish direct trunks to relieve Lagrange tandem.

Rick Kaska described (and drew) the Detroit architecture. Attachment 4 shows a sketch of the architecture.

We discussed the growth projections and plans for the Detroit area. However, there was no TCG representative from their Southfield office to address these issues. TCG estimated that their traffic would double over the next 12 months.

Currently, Ameritech has installed an OC-3 to the TCG switch. This facility is at capacity. Ameritech ordered an OC-12 to provide facility relief. However, we have put this on hold until the architecture issue is resolved. In the interim we are borrowing facilities from TCG to augment the trunk groups.

We reviewed the proposed architecture that was agreed to at the 4/4. However, TCG indicated that they want to revisit this and get an interpretation of what is required under the agreement. The Ameritech belief is that the proposed architecture complies with the agreement.

We discussed adding direct end office trunk groups to relieve the tandems. Both TCG and Ameritech identified candidate offices. These will be implemented selectively. That is, implement the groups that will provide the most relief until we can resolve the architecture issue.

We agreed to combine local and toll traffic on the same group -- both direct and tandem groups. We also agreed to maintain the 1 way trunk groups with each company collocating with the other.

The next meeting is May 22 to continue planning the interconnection networks. Details to follow.

Jim Smith

Attachment 1

TELEPORT NETWORK PLANNING MEETING
April 23, 1997

Mission: Design a robust network for the Chicago and Detroit LATAs
- that complies with the Interconnection Agreement

- Agenda:**
- 1 Introduction and logistics
 - 2 Describe handouts to facilitate network planning
 - TCG NXX codes
 - Maps of Chicago and Detroit LATA
 - Tandem sectors
 - 3 Review current network architecture
 - 4 Discuss TCG future plans and forecasts
 - 5 Develop Interconnection Agreement architecture
 - 6 Design TCG interconnection architecture
 - 7 Review disaster recovery options
 - 8 Plan transition steps from current to proposed network
 - 9 Determine action plans and timetable
 - 10 Other items